John Lentz
P.O. Box 118
Muskego, WI. 53150

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commision
Office of the Secretary
Room 222
1919 M. Street NW
Washington, DC 20554

Saturday, July 11, 1998

RE: Reply to the NAB Comments on Creation of a LPFM Service

This is a letter in response to some of the comments made against the creation of a Low Power radio service in RM-9208, RM-9242, and RM-9246. This is in response to National Association of Broadcasters, USA Digital Radio, L.P., and ACAMBA. The most critical and invalid arguments made was on interference to In-Band-On-Channel (IBOC), using old FCC resources to use against the creation of a Low Power radio service and insufficient information regarding a Low Power radio station's type of programming content.

The NAB's claim of interference on short-spacing adjacent channels is not true. There have been 460 full-powered FM stations (grandfathered short spaced stations) operating on 2nd and 3rd adjacent channels for many years, nationwide, with no interference complaints. If these more powerful FULL-POWER FM stations don't cause interference using the 2nd and 3rd adjacent channels, then certainly LPFM stations will NOT cause interference, especially because of its low power. Likewise no interference will result in the future use of In-Band-On-Channel (IBOC) digital broadcasting. In the FCC Report and Order FCC 97-276, released on August 8, 1997, the FCC agreed that the use of 2nd and 3rd adjacent channels by grandfathered short spaced full-powered FM stations would not cause interference. That's the matter of record that the NAB cannot refute.

In another argument concerning "interference" to IBOC digital signals made by the NAB and USADR on how LPFM stations second and third adjacent channels to existing full powered IBOC digital signal stations would cause "interference". In a recent Radio World report, the USADR has an experimental 600 watt station broadcasting a hybrid analog/IBOC digital signal at 93.5 MHz from its offices in Columbia, MD. A search centered in Columbia, MD revealed that the test facility will be second adjacent to WPOC 93.1 in Baltimore, MD (which is a full Class B facility about 13 km distance from Columbia) and WKYS 93.9 in Washington (also a full Class B, but about 35 km distant). Note that the experimental facility is within the protected contours of both stations. Now how would a 100 watt LPFM station cause interference as opposed to the USADR's experimental station using 600 watts?

It is very obvious to me that the NAB and several broadcasting stations are fighting against these petitions to avoid any further competition from low power community based stations. There claims of microstations causing interference does not make sense. Since the idea of a low power based microstation will eventually be licensed by the FCC, it is apparent the FCC will issue a licensed to a microstation after they follow the proper legal steps it takes to obtain a FCC license. I am sure with the FCC in control of issuing frequency and power assignments as they normally do when any person or corporation puts a new radio station on the air, whether a high powered station or not, as has been the case since the existence of the FCC. The only threat of interference are from stations operating without a license. So why is the NAB and broadcast stations so worried about interference?

The NAB has claimed in there comments that there isn't enough open frequencies available. There are enough frequencies available to set up several low powered broadcast stations. I still see many new applications pending and also many receiving construction permits in the so called "tight" FM band. Depending on the micro-radio stations's power and antenna height, they can be made low enough to cover one whole concentrated community area enough for another microbroadcaster 15 or so miles away to use the same frequency. Back in the Class-D rulings there were a few 10 watt FM stations in Chicago on the air all at the sametime on one frequency. Obviously they were miles apart from each other.

Why can't the NAB and its broadcast stations work together with individuals and small groups wanting to build and place on the air a low powered community based microstation? As a possible future low powered microbroadcaster, I am willing to work things out with any of the nearby high powered radio stations and any possible low power microbroadcasters in order to propose and build my own community based low powered FM station. What hassles would I face as long as I follow the legal procedures in setting up my own station? Its even apparent when I see a new high-powered radio station going on the air for the first time in the Milwaukee market, current local area broadcasters become upset because it means further competition. I've seen unselfish fighting among competing broadcasters such the case when WFMI (now-WPNT) 106.9 in Brookfield, WI signed on the air with a smooth jazz format, using the slogan "Smooth Jazz". Then back when ex-WQFM changed its calls and format to WJZI on 93.3 in Milwaukee to a smooth jazz format, started using the "Smooth Jazz" slogan as well and in the meantime contacted the management of WFMI to stop using the "Smooth Jazz" slogan. I guess a verbal fight went on between the 2 stations arguing over each others right in the way they operate there stations. It only shows how selfish some of these big corporate broadcasters and NAB members can be. With such bad attitude among these broadcasters, they almost don't even deserve to operate a radio station.

A community based, low power Microstation is needed to solely cover and offer more locally community based programs such as local news, sporting events, and any other local and syndicated produced programs. Current high powered radio stations do provide some coverage of a town or city's event located within the contours of there broadcast signal. However most events are only covered briefly, whether it is news, weather, any important information, most of these high powered broadcast radio stations don't offer enough information to a small town or city. As you know, most of these high powered broadcast stations have several cities and towns within there coverage signal, it appears they cannot cover enough details to one city when they are trying to concentrate on all cities and towns.

Please seriously consider allowing the creation of a Low Power Broadcast service. There are several great opportunities for a Low Power broadcast service, allowing more people to express there views. Offering more opportunities for non-experienced people of any age, sex, and/or race, to become disc-jockeys and entertain local audiences. Also provide local sports programming, especially high school sports coverage, as well as provide coverage to local town meetings. Many local citizens would like to be able to set up there own radio programs and offer them over a community based low power radio station. More people are willing to provide a service to there community on radio instead of cable TV which requires a lot more work. With a local cable TV station, it requires expensive equipment and more time involved in editing, where as in radio it is less time consuming and lot less work is involved.

Please give serious consideration over the many arguments in favor of a Low Powered broadcast service. I find most arguments of people opposing the creation of a Low Powered service to be off base. I have pointed most of the comments from the NAB, IBOC and many radio stations opposing the petitions. Most of there arguments made are senseless. After much study the FCC will find that proposing Low Power broadcast stations will work out. So please consider many of the favored comments and the petitions to create a Low Power Broadcast service.

Sincerely,

John M. Lentz